DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 609 HE 006 200

AUTHOR Metlay, W.; And Others
TITLE The Accepted Applicant Survey-1972 and 1973: Important Criteria in Choosing a College, and Perceptions of Hofstra by Students Who Did Not Attend. Report No. 107.
INSTITUTION Hofstra Univ., Hempstead, N.Y. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
PUB DATE Dec 74
NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College Choice; *Higher Education; Questionnaires; School Environment; *Student Application; Student Attitudes; *Student Characteristics; *Surveys

ABSTRACT

In 1972 and 1973, a 37-item questionnaire, the Accepted Application Survey (AAS), was mailed to a number of students. In the 1972 study the focus was on applicants accepted by Hofstra but who decided not to attend (no-shows). Approximately 45 percent of the 1972 population completed and returned the questionnaire. In 1973, the questionnaire was mailed to both no-shows and those who did attend. In the former and latter categories, 28 percent and 31 percent, respectively, completed and returned the questionnaire. The AAS was designed to elicit certain kinds of information about factors relevant to university life. Such factors include academic, location, financial, social activities, external advice, and a general category that includes items that are mixtures of two or more factors. Findings indicate: (1) No-shows rated their attended university more positively than they did Hofstra, although they rated Hofstra in a positive manner as well. (2) In 1973, more than 50 percent of the no-shows rated Hofstra positively on the following academic items: academic reputation, course offerings, availability of desired major, innovative curriculum, and quality of the faculty. (3) The positive rated items included under location were: commuting convenience, easy access to home for residential students, and general geographic location. (4) Under social activities, the positive items were: degree of freedom allowed students, extra-curricular activities, and dorms available. Appendixes include the applicants' survey and the accepted applicants' survey. Statistical tables accompany the text. (Author/PG)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED101609

Report #107
December 1974

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY

The Accepted Applicant Survey-1972 and 1973: Important Criteria In Choosing a College, and Perceptions of Hofstra by Students Who Did Not Attend

W. Metlay, P. Lichtenstein, P. Ferrarra, P. List, J. McArdle

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Summary

In 1972 and 1973 a 37 item questionnaire, the Accepted Applicant Survey (AAS) was mailed to a number of students. In 1972, the focus of study was applicants accepted by Hofstra but who decided not to attend (no-shows). Approximately 45% of the 1972 population completed and returned the questionnaire. In 1973, the questionnaire was mailed to both no-shows and those who did attend (shows). In the former and latter categories, 28% and 31% completed and returned the questionnaire. The AAS was designed to elicit certain kinds of information about factors relevant to University life. Such factors include academic, location, financial, social activities, external advice, and a general category which includes items that are mixtures of two or more factors. The information concerned whether the factor was important in influencing the applicants decision as to which college to attend, and whether Hofstra or the University the applicant attended was viewed negatively or positively with respect to the 37 items. One additional request of the questionnaire was for all applicants to indicate whether Hofstra was the first, second, or third through fifth choice school. The results of the survey were organized around four major areas. First, a breakdown of the 1972 and 1973 samples by the predictor variable of college preference was presented. Second, the 1973 samples of freshman and transfer students were analyzed in terms of those factors considered important in choosing a college. These factors were further analyzed in order to evaluate which factors discriminated among the 1973 samples. In the third analysis, trends between the 1972 and 1973 samples were considered. Differences between the 1972 and 1973 freshmen on those attributes considered important were analyzed for the total group as well as in terms of the predictor variable of college preference. The final analysis was an assessment of the 1972 and 1973 samples on students' reactions to Hofstra and the college they actually attended.

With regard to the breakdown of no-show freshmen by college preference, the results between 1972 and 1973 were quite similar. Of 725 freshman respondents in 1972, 8% indicated Hofstra as their first choice, 49% had Hofstra as their second choice, and 43% had Hofstra as their third-fifth choice. In 1973, the percentages for the three categories were 9%, 43%, and 48% respectively.

Analysis of the 1973 no-show freshmen responses as to which of the 37 items were important in influencing their decision about colleges, indicated that 23 of the items met a criterion of importance. When the items were grouped by factor;

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

academic, location, and financial factors were the most important with social activities, external advice and mixed factors being of lesser importance. The 1972 sample of no-shows indicated almost exactly the same kind of result. When the 23 important items were analyzed in terms of an ability to discriminate among the 1973 samples, nine of the items showed such an ability. Finer analysis of these nine items indicated that no-show students considered quality of faculty, financial factors, and number of students as more important in choosing a college than did students who attended Hofstra. On the other hand, students who did attend Hofstra rated commuting convenience as more critical than those who did not attend this University.

When students rated Hofstra with respect to those items they felt were important in choosing a college, certain attitudes and trends were revealed. First, no-shows quite obviously rated their attended University more positively than they did Hofstra although they rated Hofstra in a positive manner as well. In 1973 more than 50% of the no-shows rated Hofstra positively on the following academic items: academic reputation, course offerings, availability of desired major, innovative curriculum, and quality of the faculty. The positively rated items included under location were: commuting convenience, easy access to home for residential students and general geographic location. Under social activities and mixted factors, the positive items were: degree of freedom allowed students, extra-curricular activities and dorms available. These may be considered positive attributes of Hofstra. For some no-shows the amount of financial aid offered at Hofstra was viewed more favorably than at school finally chosen but did not change their decision. In a similar vein, attitudes toward amount of financial aid offered at school attending were more positive for Hofstra students than students attending other colleges.

There were, however, clear differences between those who attended Hofstra and those who did not. On all of the items considered to be important in choosing a college, no-show students rated Hofstra University less positively than did students who attended in the fall semester of 1973. Those items that most clearly discriminated (a difference of more than 30%) shows from no-shows as far as reactions to Hofstra were; career and job considerations and graduate school considerations, amount of financial aid offered, number of students, and appearance of campus. These might be considered items that need looking into. A few more items that need looking into are: social activities, total cost, family advice and what students had to say. Hofstra shows just weren't as positive about these items as shows at other colleges. Finally, there were clear and strong trends in the data indicating that between 1972 and 1973 no-show students had an increased negative reaction to Hofstra University. The items most heavily affected were: academic reputation, career and job and graduate school considerations, general geographic location, extra-curricular activities, family advice and what students had to say.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Report #107
December 1974

The Accepted Applicant Survey-1972 and 1973: Important Criteria In Choosing a College, and Perceptions of Hofstra by Students Who Did and Did Not Attend

W. Metlay, P. Lichtenstein, P. Ferrarra, P. List, J. McArdle

Introduction

One major concern for those involved in higher education at private institutions has been the recent reduction in undergraduate enrollment. In this present study, an attempt was made to discover some of the reasons for this phenomenon by surveying the attitudes of applicants accepted at Hofstra University. The present research report covers a two-year period; applicants accepted to Hofstra University for the semester beginning September 1972, and those accepted for the fall semester (September) 1973.

1972 Sample and Questionnaire

For the 1972 sample, data were collected by a questionnaire mailed to 1721 accepted applicants who indicated by Hofstra's Candidate Reply Form (CRF) that they were not coming to the University. Out of this population, 784 students (approximately 45%) completed and returned the questionnaire. Of the 784 students 725 would have been freshmen and 59 would have been transfer students in the fall 1972 semester. The questionnaire, or as termed in this report, The Accepted Applicant Survey (AAS), had two critical sections (see Appendix 1). First, a predictor variable, indicating whether Hofstra was the Accepted Applicant's first, second, or third-fifth choice of school, and second, the dependent variable consisting of thirty-seven items for which the applicant had three decisions to make. First, whether the item was important in influencing his decision as to which college to attend, second, to check whether he considered Hofstra positively or negatively with respect to the item, and third, to make that same decision with respect to the college he actually chose to attend. The thirty-seven items were actually designed to elicit information relevant to six factors: academic, location, financial, social activities, external advice, and the final category (mixed) which included six items which were not purely any one factor. Table 1 is a consolidation of these items into the six groups indicating the items under each factor, and the number of the item on the questionnaire.

1973 Sample and Questionnaire

For the 1973 sample, the data were collected by questionnaire mailed to 4996 freshman and transfer accepted applicants. This was a significant change in sampling procedure from 1972, when the population was specified as all individuals who had mailed in Hofstra's Candidate Reply Form (CRF) indicating they would not attend the fall semester. The 1973 population consisted of all individuals who were accepted by the University, and therefore included individuals who were coming to Hofstra (shows) as well as those who were not

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1

The Six Factors

Academic

1. Academic reputation
2. Course offerings
3. Availability of major
4. Individualized academic program
5. Innovative curriculum
6. Courses probably not too difficult
7. Quality of faculty
9. Grading system used
19. Career and job considerations
20. Graduate school considerations
36. Transfer students: credits accepted from previous college

Location

13. Commuting convenience
14. Easy access to home for a residential student
15. General geographic location
16. Proximity to New York City

Financial

11. Total cost
12. Amount of financial aid offered

Social Activities

10. Number of students
21. Appearance of campus
22. Church affiliated
23. Closely-knit college community
24. Diversified student body
25. Students involved in political activities
26. Degree of freedom allowed students
28. Intercollegiate sports emphasized
29. Extracurricular activities
30. Social activities

External Advice

31. High School guidance counselor's advice
32. College admissions representative's advice
33. Family advice
34. What students had to say

Mixed

8. School calendar system used
17. Dorms available
18. A predominantly residential college
27. Availability of counseling services
35. Publications of the college or university
37. Other

planning to attend (no-shows). In contrast to the 1972 sample, this latter group of no-shows included individuals who never responded to Hofstra with the CRF. However, as reported below in more detail, the percentage of individuals in the 1973 sample of no-shows who had not mailed in the CRF form was rather small, approximately 12%.

Of the 4996 total accepted applicants for 1973, 1986 said they were coming to Hofstra in September, and 3010 said they were not. All of the 3010 no-shows were mailed the AAS modified in one important respect from the 1972 form (see Appendix 2). The wording in part 3 was changed in the 1973 form to read "If you do not expect to attend Hofstra, please use Column 3 to check whatever items seemed to you, to be strong points of the college (if any) that you do expect to attend". For many of the individuals receiving the form, that phrasing seemed to suggest that if they were not attending Hofstra, just use Column 3. Because a check mark in Columns 2 or 3 was interpreted as a positive attitude, and absence of a check mark was interpreted as a negative attitude, it would be inappropriate to include in our analyses all those individuals who left Column 2 blank because this would heavily load the negative attitude toward the University. All such individuals who seemed to misinterpret this question were therefore excluded from the major analyses of this report.

Of the 3010 no-shows, 841 (28%) returned and completed the AAS, while 2169 did not. Of the 841 responders, 758 were freshmen and 83 were transfer students. Of these 758 freshmen, 211 filled out the form incorrectly. Useable data for the 1973 sample of freshman no-shows therefore totaled 547 applicants. Out of the 83 no-show transfer students, 58 filled out the AAS form correctly.

As indicated above, 1986 applicants said that they were coming to Hofstra University in September 1973. All of these individuals were mailed a modified AAS form as shown in Appendix 3. The major difference between the two 1973 forms (no-shows and shows) was that in the latter's form they were only requested to indicate their positive or negative attitude toward Hofstra University. Of the 1986 shows, 606 (31%) completed and returned the AAS, while 1380 did not. Of the 606 responders, 374 would have been freshmen and 232 would have been transfer students in the fall of 1973.

Characteristics of 1972 and 1973 Samples-Scholastic Aptitude Test Scores and High School Deciles

In 1972 and 1973 all accepted applicants were requested to provide their Scholastic Aptitude Test Scores (SAT), both verbal and quantitative, as well as their high school decile. With respect to these characteristics, certain comparisions within each year and between years were quite vital in order to understand the nature of the samples drawn in 1972 and 1973. Table 2 is a breakdown of the high school decile, the SAT verbal and mathematical scores, and the combined totals for entering freshmen for the two years concerned in this report. Transfer students were deleted from the above groups due to incomplete information on these variables.

As can be seen from the 1972 data, the no-show respondent, i.e. those who were actually sampled in the study (725 no-show freshman) differ from the 1972 no-show non-respondent with respect to the high school decile ranks. Their mean high school decile of 2.92 was higher than the 3.14 for the non-respondents, but their scores on the SAT verbal, mathematics and combined total were quite similar.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The 1973 samples of show and no-show respondents and non-respondents were also very similar on SAT scores. Again, the only difference that does exist is with respect to the high school decile rank of respondents. The 1973 show respondents used in the analysis are higher than the 1973 show non-respondent population and the 1973 no-show respondents have higher decile ranks than no-show non-respondents. When the characteristics of the 1972 and 1973 samples are compared against each other, the major result is the similarity of SAT scores and the dissimilarity of the decile ranks. In 1972, the no-show respondent had a high school rank of 2.92. The 1973 no-show respondents ranked a little higher (mean decile rank=2.66). The SAT verbal scores were all approximately the same; 517 for the 1972 sample and 522 for the 1973 no-show respondents. Although there was some difference in the math scores, 551 and 566 for the 1972 and 1973 samples respectively, Yuker, Block and Finn[1] suggest that this is not a very large difference.

In summary, the 1972 sample included only no-shows, while the 1973 data included no-shows as well as a sample of individuals who indicated that they were coming to Hofstra University. Although different sampling procedures were used in 1973 and in 1972, approximately 88% of the 1973 no-show sample was similar to the 1972 no-show sample in that both were from a population that used the Candidate Reply Form to respond to the University that they were not coming. Additionally, characteristics of the 1972 and 1973 samples as measured by SAT scores, showed marked similarities, not only as compared to the non-respondent populations of shows and no-shows, but between the years as well. The higher high school ranks for respondents for both years means that the conclusions drawn from the samples must be used cautiously when generalizing to the entire population of accepted applicants. However, since the students we are most interested in attracting are the students with higher deciles, the findings will be most useful. Finally, although the 1973 questionnaire posed certain problems with respect to the sample of useable data, the size of the sample was large enough for certain major conclusions to be derived.

Results

The results of this report are presented in terms of descriptive statistics; that is, all comparisons are made through the use of percentages and differences in percentages. The first major analysis was the breakdown of the 1972 and 1973 sample by the predicted variable of college preference, i.e. Hofstra University as the applicants' first, second, or third through fifth choice school. In the second analysis, the 1973 sample of freshman and transfer applicants were analyzed in terms of those factors considered to be important in choosing a college. These factors were further analyzed in order to evaluate which factors discriminated among the 1973 samples. In the third analysis, changes between the 1972 and 1973 freshman on attributes considered important as well as on the important items in terms of the predictor variable of college preference were analyzed. In the final analysis, students' reactions to Hofstra and the college they actually attended were compared over many samples and between 1972 and 1973.

[1]Yuker, H.E., and Finn, S.R. Perceptions of Hofstra by Applicants Who Did Not Attend. Center for the Study of Higher Education, Hofstra University, Report #68, March 1968.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

1972 and 1973 Sample Questionnaire
SAT Scores and High School Deciles

Group (Frosh Only)	High School Decile	SAT Verbal	SAT Math	SAT Total
1972 No-Shows	3.07 (N=2212)	513 (N=2329)	545	1058
1972 Shows	3.42 (N=1036)	518 (N=1085)	545	1063
1972 No-Show Respondents	2.92 (N=725)	517 (N=725)	551	1068
1972 No-Show Non-Respondents	3.14 (N=1487)	512 (N=1604)	542	1054
1973 No-Shows	3.04 (N=2592)	506 (N=2662)	545	1051
1973 Shows	3.34 (N=850)	499 (N=876)	536	1035
1973 No Show Respondents	2.66 (N=527)	522 (N=538)	566	1088
1973 No Show Non-Respondents	3.14 (N=2065)	502 (N=2124)	538	1040
1973 Show Respondents	3.12 (N=357)	509 (N=366)	540	1049
1973 Show Non-Respondents	3.50 (N=493)	492 (N=510)	526	1018

Note: 1) Transfers were deleted from the above groups due to incomplete information on these variables.
2) In the 1973 sample of no-show respondents, 207 individuals who incorrectly filled out the questionnaire were not included in the '73 no-show respondent group above but were included as non-respondents.
3) Averages based on those students for whom data are available.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I. College Preference

1972 No-Show Freshmen

As reported previously, data were available on 784 applicants. Of the 784, 725 would have been freshmen and 59 would have been transfer students in the fall semester. Of the 725 freshmen, Hofstra was the first choice of 58 (8%), the second choice of 345 (49%) and the third through fifth choice of 305 (43%) students. Seventeen applicants did not indicate a choice. Transfer students were not divided by choice, since there were too few to make this a meaningful division.

1973 No-Show Freshmen

Data were available on 547 no-show freshmen who filled out the AAS form correctly. Of these 547, Hofstra was the first choice of 47 (9%), the second choice of 219 (43%), the third through fifth choice of 249 (48%) and 32 applicants did not indicate a choice. College preference of transfer students was not categorized since only 58 transfer students had filled out the AAS form correctly. In a previous section, it was reported that approximately 88% of the freshman no-show sample were individuals who had responded to Hofstra University that they were not coming with a Candidate Reply Form. The actual breakdown of this population as it relates to college preference is, of the 47 first choice freshman no-shows, 36 (77%) returned the Candidate Reply Form to the university and 11 did not. Of the 219 second choice students, 187 (95%) were CRF responders and 32 were not. Of the 249 third through fifth choice students, 227 (91%) fell into that category and 22 did not.

II. Important Factors in College Choice

1973 Sample

Of the 37 items in the questionnaire, 23 were rated as being important by more than 30% of the 1973 respondents in at least one of the following groups; freshman no-shows, freshman shows, transfer shows, or transfer no shows (see Table 3). For instance, item 17 in Table 2, dorms available, was rated as being important by 35% of the freshman no-shows, but less that 30% of each of the other groups rated it as being important; 21%, 10%, and 24% for freshman shows, transfer shows, and transfer no-shows respectively. In order to differentiate those items which certain groups did not consider to be important, Table 3 shows the less important items in parentheses.

In Table 4, the 14 items which were not rated as being important by more than 30% of the respondents in any of the four groups are presented. For instance, item 6, courses probably not too difficult, was rated as being important by 4% of the freshman no-shows, 5% of the freshman shows, 6% of the transfer shows, and 5% of the transfer no-shows.

As one goes from Table 3 to Table 4, it can be seen that some factors are more important as a whole than others. For example, of the 11 original items which compose the academic factor (see Table 1), 9 items were thought to be important by more than 30% of the respondents in at least one of the four groups, while 2 did not meet the 30% criteria. In fact, of the nine items, five of them met the criterion of 30% by all of the groups. It is important

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

Important Factors in College Choice - 1973 Applicants
(in percentages)

Factors	Freshman No-Shows N=547	Freshman Shows N=374	Transfer Shows N=232	Transfer No-Shows N=58
Academic				
1) Academic reputation	87	80	81	85
2) Course offerings	80	73	75	81
3) Availability of desired major	73	71	78	74
4) Individualized academic program	35	31	(17)	47
5) Innovative curriculum	37	(24)	(16)	33
7) Quality of faculty	68	56	49	60
19) Career and job considerations	36	38	47	47
20) Graduate school considerations	32	(27)	36	38
36) Transfer students: credits accepted from previous college	(4)	(2)	76	67
Location				
13) Commuting convenience	36	56	69	36
14) Easy access to home for a residential student	(29)	39	43	36
15) General geographic location	52	60	49	57
Financial				
11) Total cost	69	40	36	72
12) Amount of financial aid offered	45	32	30	53
Social Activities				
10) Number of students	50	41	(28)	33
21) Appearance of campus	53	49	41	47
24) Diversified student body	37	36	(22)	36
26) Degree of freedom allowed students	47	43	32	(29)
29) Extra-curricular activities	40	43	(26)	(29)
30) Social activities	39	37	(28)	31
External Advice				
33) Family advice	41	40	(18)	(17)
34) What students had to say	45	36	36	41
Mixed				
17) Dorms available	35	(21)	(10)	(24)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4

Factors Not Important in College Choice - 1973 Applicants

(in percentages)

Factors	Freshman No-Shows N=547	Freshman Shows N=374	Transfer Shows N=232	Transfer No-Shows N=58
Academic				
6) Courses probably not too difficult	4	5	6	5
9) Grading system	7	7	9	7
Location				
16) Proximity to New York City	17	21	17	22
Social Activities				
22) Church affiliated	4	2	1	5
23) Closely knit college community	23	17	13	14
25) Students involved in political activities	13	10	6	10
28) Intercollegiate sports emphasized	17	22	15	12
External Advice				
31) High school guidance counselor	27	29	7	3
32) College admissions representative	11	12	9	21
Mixed				
8) School calendar system used	9	10	10	14
18) A predominantly residential college	21	13	10	16
27) Availability of counseling services	27	28	27	28
35) Hofstra University Publications	20	21	16	14
37) Other: Specify_____	7	10	5	21

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to notice that of these five items, the first three items, which were also the first three items which appeared in the accepted applicant survey, were those items which were considered to be those most important by freshman and transfer students. Even the finanical factor of total cost, item 11, was not as high as these academic factors. This suggests, perhaps, the influence of a primacy variable in this study. Nevertheless, items 19, 20, and 36, career and job considerations, graduate school considerations, and credits accepted from previous college, were also evaluated as being rather important, suggesting that academic factors are still rather critical items in making decisions about colleges. Location was also an important factor, since three of those four items were rated as being important. Both of the items of the financial factor were important, while about half of the social activity items were rated as being important and about half were not. External advice items also were equally divided between Table 3 and Table 4. Only one of the mixed factor items was considered important, the other five were not. This leads one to the conclusion that academic, location, and financial factors may be the most important criteria in college choice, with the social activities, external advice, and mixed factors being of progressively decreasing importance.

After the 23 important items in college choice were isolated (by the criterion of greater than 30%), an attempt was made to determine which of them discriminated among the four groups, or which of the important items, respondents in one group had rated as being more important than respondents in the other groups. A difference of 10-15% was considered large enough in order for it to be considered significant depending upon the number in the group being analyzed. The smaller the number involved in the comparison, the larger the percentage needed for the difference to be considered stable. For example, as shown in Table 3, the percentage of freshman no-shows, freshman shows, transfer shows, and transfer no-shows, who rated item 4, individualized academic program, as important were, 35%, 31%, 17%, and 47% respectively. If the percentage of freshman shows who thought this item important is subtracted from the percentage of freshman no-shows who thought it important, there is a difference of 4% (35-31%) which is not significant by our criterion of 10% difference. Since only the important items were to be evaluated in this analysis, comparisons involving transfer shows (17%) for item 4 were excluded, even though certain percentage differences exceeded the criterion of 10%.

All of the 23 items in Table 3 were examined to determine which of them discriminated among the groups and the percentage differences scores are presented in Table 5. Items in Table 4 were not examined for the same reasons given above, i.e. even if there was a 10% difference between groups on these items, each of them was not deemed important by enough people within a group to be considered to be important in college choice. As can be seen in Table 5, parenthesis are placed around all difference scores which do not meet the criterion of 10%. Columns which are left blank, indicate that one group involved in the comparison does not meet the importance criterion of 30%. Of the 23 items considered important by the 1973 sample, Table 5 shows that only 7 met the criterion of discriminability among the four groups. One of the reasons why certain items did not discriminate among the groups was that the item was considered to be very important by most of the people in the sample. For example, item 1, academic reputation, was considered to be important by 80% or more of the people in each group. Such large percentages were also the case for items 2 and 3, course offerings and availability of desired major, respectively. On the other hand, item 13, commuting convenience, which

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5

Important Factors that Discriminate in College Choice - 1973 Applicants

(in percentages)

Factors	Freshman No-Shows minus Freshman Shows	Freshman Shows minus Transfer Shows	Transfer No-Shows minus Transfer Shows	Freshman No-Shows minus Transfer No-Shows
Academic				
7) Quality of faculty	+12	(+ 7)	(+11)	(+8)
Location				
13) Commuting convenience	-20	-13	-33	(0)
15) General geographic location	(- 8)	+11	(+ 8)	(-5)
Financial				
11) Total cost	+29	(+ 4)	+36	(-3)
12) Amount of financial aid offered	+13	(+ 2)	+23	(-8)
Social Activities				
10) Number of students	(+ 9)			
26) Degree of freedom	(+ 4)	+11		+17

is considered to be important by 36-69% of the respondents, is a group discriminator because it produces three significant difference scores. Specifically, freshman shows considered it to be more important than freshman who did not attend Hofstra (a difference of 20%), but the former group did not consider it as important as transfer students who attended, a difference score of 13%. When transfer show students were compared to transfer students who did not attend Hofstra University, a difference of 33% is revealed, indicating the importance of commuting convenience to attending students. Additionally, the fact that there was no difference between freshman and transfer no-shows, is again evidence for the contention that no-show students do not consider this location factor to be as important as those who decide to attend this university.

In general, the results of Table 5 point out two major findings. First, certain factors discriminate among the groups better than others. Both items under the financial factor showed an ability to discriminate, and two of the four items which make up the location factor met the discriminability criterion on at least one comparsion. With respect to the items under academic, social activities, external advice, and mixed factors, discriminability of the items was not as good. Only one of the eleven academic items, and two of the ten social activity items

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

discriminated on at least one comparison. As far as external advice and mixed factors are concerned, none of the comparisons were very large. The second major finding, suggests that particular groups tend to rate certain factors similarly. For example, no-show students, regardless of whether they were freshman or transfers felt that financial factors were more important than students who attended Hofstra University and commuting convenience less important. When freshman no-shows are compared to freshman shows with respect to total cost, a difference score of 29% is revealed. Transfer no-shows also thought that total cost was more important than transfer shows since a different score of 36% is obtained in this comparison. The same trend is evident with respect to item 12, amount of financial aid, since no-show students felt this item to be much more important than freshman or transfer shows. With regard to commuting convenience both freshman shows and transfer shows thought this was more important than applicants who didn't show.

In summary, of the 37 items sampled in the Accepted Applicant Survey, 23 of them were felt to be important in making a decision about higher education; academic, location, and financial items were the most important factors, with social activities, external advice, and mixed factors, being progressively of decreasing importance. Only 7 of the 23 items discriminated (by a criterion of 10% or 15% difference) between at least two of the groups comprising the 1973 sample. The major finding with respect to differences between freshman and transfer shows and no-shows, was that no-show freshman considered the quality of faculty more important in their choice of a college, and both freshman and transfer no-shows considered financial factors more important, while those that attended Hofstra rated commuting convenience as more important.

III. 1972 vs. 1973 Trends

Important Attributes

In order to compare trends between 1972 and 1973, the criterion of 30% or greater adapted for the 1973 sample was also used for the 1972 data. That is, an item was considered important if 30% or more of the sample checked that attribute on the AAS. Since the 1972 sample was only concerned with no-show freshmen and transfers, and since the samples of no-show transfer students were small for both years, 59 and 58 for 1972 and 1973 respectively, freshmen and transfers were combined for this analysis. The proportion of transfers to freshmen was approximately 8% and 10% in 1972 and 1973 respectively, indicating an acceptable degree of variation between the two years.

Columns 1 and 2 in Table 6 present comparisons between 1972 and 1973 with respect to the items which these samples considered important in their college choice. The first major conclusion which can be drawn from this comparison is that of the 23 items rated important by the 1973 sample, 22 were similarly rated by the 1972 sample. The only attribute included in the 1972 column which did not meet the criterion of 30%, was graduate school considerations, and in that case, 29% of the sample listed it as an important item. Second, the percentage of individuals rating an attribute important is consistently stable between the years. In only 2 of the 23 attributes, did the percentage difference between 1972 and 1973 reach levels in excess of 10%. Specifically, amount of financial aid increased in

Table 6

Important Factors in College Choice for No-Shows: 1972 vs. 1973 by Preference in Percentages

Factors	(1) Freshman & Transfer 1972 (N=780)	(2) Freshman & Transfer 1973 (N=605)	(3) 1972 Preference 1st. N=58	(4) 1972 Preference 2nd. N=345	(5) 1972 Preference 3rd-5th. N=305	(6) 1973 Preference 1st. N=47	(7) 1973 Preference 2nd. N=219	(8) 1973 Preference 3rd-5th. N=249
Academic								
1) Academic reputation	84	86	79	82	89	81	86	89
2) Course offerings	82	80	83	80	85	79	77	83
3) Availability of desired major	75	73	72	73	79	64	70	78
4) Individual academic program	35	36	24	31	39	32	34	37
5) Innovative curriculum	33	36	22	29	38	38	37	37
7) Quality of faculty	66	68	55	66	68	69	64	74
19) Career and job considerations	31	37	40	29	31	40	35	40
20) Graduate school considerations	29	33	29	25	32	36	25	37
36) Transfer students: credits accepted	59 Transfer only	67	--	--	--	--	--	--
Location								
13) Commuting convenience	38	36	52	42	32	55	44	26
14) Easy access to home (for a resid. stud.)	45	29	52	49	40	45	31	24
15) General geographic location	51	53	48	49	55	36	52	54
Financial								
11) Total cost	65	69	88	61	66	92	66	68
12) Amount of financial aid offered	35	46	55	34	30	70	43	44
Social Activities								
10) Number of students	55	48	55	49	62	43	48	53
21) Appearance of campus	61	52	57	56	69	43	49	57
24) Diversified student body	40	37	36	37	43	36	32	43
26) Degree of freedom allowed students	50	45	48	45	54	43	46	49
29) Extra-curricular activities	43	39	45	40	45	34	38	43
30) Social activities	42	39	36	38	49	40	35	43
External Advice								
33) Family advice	31	39	31	31	31	40	38	44
34) What students had to say	38	45	41	37	39	40	42	49
Mixed								
17) Dorms available	37	34	34	27	47	17	29	44

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

importance for 1972 to 1973 by 11%, and easy access to home decreased from 45% to 29%, but the wording of the item restricted the 1973 respondents to residential respondents so the decrease was expected.

Although most of the attributes showed percentage changes from 1972 to 1973 of only two to four percent, five items on the AAS had moderate increases, while two demonstrated moderate decreases in percentage importance. The four increases were; career and job considerations 31% to 37%; credit accepted from previous college (transfers only-59% to 67%); family advice (31% to 39%), and finally, what students had to say (38% to 45%). The two attributes which decreased moderately from 1972 to 1973 were; number of students (55% to 48%) and the appearance of campus (61% to 52%).

College Preference-No Show Freshman Only

This section examines freshmen exclusively within the 1972-73 AAS samples as a function of Hofstra as a first, second, or third through fifth preference school. Transfers were excluded due to the small sample size that was obtained when they were subdivided by the preference category. It should also be noted that those freshmen who did not indicate a preference were included in the overall trends showed in the first two columns in Table 6. However, they could not be included in the preference analysis. This group of non-reference people resulted in approximately a 5% mortality for this particular analysis.

Within 1972 and 1973

The major conclusion which can be reached from the analysis of differences between individuals who chose Hofstra as their first choice school and those who chose it as their second or third-fifth choice, is that academic and social activities factors are more important to the latter group, while financial and commuting attributes are more important to the former. These trends are not only strong, but they are remarkably consistant between the 1972 and 1973 samples.

Specifically, columns 3 - 5 and 4 - 6, in Table 6 have been reanalyzed as percentage differences between Hofstra as a first choice school and Hofstra as a third through fifth choice school, separately for 1972 and 1973, and the results presented in Table 7. The 1972 differences between preference levels appear in column 1, while column 2 presents the percentage differences for 1973. Depending on the number involved in any given comparison, a difference of 10-15% is probably stable enough to be worth considering. Minus signs indicate that the attribute was less important for those individuals who rated Hofstra as their third through fifth choice shcool. It is readily discernable that academic factors, specifically academic reputation, individualized academic program, and innovative curriculum, and quality of faculty for the 1972 sample and availability of desired major for the 1973 sample increased in importance for the third through fifth choice students. Analysis of the financial and location factors show an exact reverse trend. Except for general geographic location, Hofstra first choice individuals felt all the important items under these two factors to be more important than those who chose Hofstra as their third through fifth choice school.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 7

Differences in Importance of Factors in College Choice Between No-Show Students Who Rated Hofstra First Choice and Third-Fifth Choice for 1972 and 1973
(in percentages)

Factor	Year (1) 1972 3rd - 5th Choice Minus First Choice	Year (2) 1973 3rd - 5th Choice Minus First Choice
Academic		
1) Academic reputation	10	8
2) Course offerings	2	4
3) Availability of desired major	7	14
4) Individualized academic program	15	5
5) Innovative curriculum	16	- 1
7) Quality of faculty	13	5
19) Career and job considerations	- 9	4
20) Graduate school considerations	3	1
Location		
13) Commuting convenience	-20	-29
14) Easy access to home (for a residential student)	-12	-21
15) General geographic location	7	18
Financial		
11) Total cost	-22	-24
12) Amount of financial aid offered	-25	-26
Social Activities		
10) Number of students	7	10
21) Appearance of campus	12	14
24) Diversified student body	7	7
26) Degree of freedom allowed student	6	6
29) Extra-curricular activities	*	9
30) Social activities	13	3
External Advice		
33) Family advice	*	4
34) What students had to say	- 2	9
Mixed		
17) Dorms available	13	27

* Less than .5%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 8

Differences in Importance of Factors in College Choice
Between 1972 and 1973 for No-Show Students by College Preference

(in percentages)

Factors	(1) 1973-1972 1st Choice	(2) 1973-1972 2nd Choice	(3) 1973-1972 3 - 5 Choice
Academic			
1) Academic reputation	2	4	0
2) Course offerings	- 4	- 3	- 2
3) Availability of desired major	- 8	- 3	- 1
4) Individualized academic program	8	3	- 2
5) Innovative curriculum	16	8	- 1
7) Quality of faculty	14	- 2	6
19) Career and job considerations	*	6	9
20) Graduate school considerations	7	*	5
Location			
13) Commuting convenience	3	2	- 6
14) Easy access to home for residential stud.	- 7	-18	-16
15) General geographic location	-12	3	- 1
Financial			
11) Total cost	4	5	2
12) Amount of financial aid offered	15	9	14
Social activities			
10) Number of students	-12	- 1	- 9
21) Appearance of campus	-14	- 7	-12
24) Diversified student body	*	- 5	*
26) Degree of freedom allowed student	- 5	1	- 5
29) Extra-curricular activities	-11	- 2	- 2
30) Social activities	4	- 3	- 6
External advice			
33) Family advice	9	7	13
34) What students had to say	- 1	5	10
Mixed			
17) Dorms available	-17	2	- 3

*Less than .5%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Finally, the question of availability of dorms was more important for third-fifth choice students than first choice especially in 1973.

Between 1972 and 1973

In a previous section which discussed trends between 1972 and 1973 on the important attributes of college choice, a general summary was that the two samples were remarkably similar. When preference level is considered, this is no longer so; there are differences between the years. To analyze these attributes, columns 3 and 6, 4 and 7, and 5 and 8 of Table 6 were compared and percentage differences are shown in Table 8. Minus signs indicate greater importance attributed to the items by the 1972 sample. Columns 1, 2, and 3, in Table 8 show these percentage differences for Hofstra as a first, second, or third through fifth choice school, respectively. Although the pattern which emerges from these data is rather complex, certain summaries can be attempted. First, there are many differences between the 1972 and 1973 samples. Among the students who chose Hofstra as their first choice, eight out of twenty-two important items showed moderate or large changes between the two years. Second, for those attributes which showed these changes between 1972 and 1973 there was some degree of consistency as it related to overall factors. For example, out of the eight academic items, two showed moderate or large changes between 1972 and 1973. Both changed in the direction toward increased importance for the 1973 sample. This same trend (more important in 1973 than 1972) exists for amount of financial aid as well.

When the data for the location and student activity factors are analyzed, certain trends opposite from those discussed above are indicated. For example, the 1973 sample rated general geographic location, number of students, appearance of campus, extra curricular activities and availability of dorms as less important than the 1972 sample.

Applicants who said Hofstra was their second choice appeared not to differ on the importance of factors over the two years.

For applicants listing Hofstra as their third to fifth choice, amount of financial aid offered, family advice, and what students had to say, became more important during 1973 and appearance of campus became less important.

In summary, preference level must be considered in discussing the trends between 1972 and 1973. In general, first choice freshmen became more interested in academic and financial aid factors than in location and social activities factors.

IV. Students' Attitudes Toward Hofstra and Their Attended University-1972 and 1973

All accepted applicants for 1973 and no-show applicants for 1972 were asked to indicate on the questionnaire whether their reactions to Hofstra for each of the 37 checklist items was positive. No-shows, in addition, were asked to indicate whether their reaction to the school they chose to attend (other) was positive for each checklist item. The analysis of student attitudes is based on those students who indicated the item was important to them. The complete data of their reactions are given in Table 9.

Table 9

Students' Reactions to Hofstra & Other Colleges in Percentages

Factors	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	Freshman (No-Show)						Freshman Show	Freshman No-Show-Show	Transfer Show
Academic	1972 +H	1973 +H	1972 +0	1973 +0	1973 +H,-0	1973 -H,+0	1973 +H	1973 +H	1973 +H
1) Academic reputation	67	56	93	87	9	40	83	-27	82
2) Course offerings	71	72	93	86	11	25	86	-14	78
3) Availability of desired major	70	68	93	88	8	28	81	-13	74
4) Individualized academic program	56	48	81	78	11	41	75	-27	63
5) Innovative curriculum	62	54	86	78	16	40	75	-21	74
7) Quality of faculty	57	51	91	88	5	42	79	-28	74
19) Career & job considerations	55	40	78	80	8	48	73	-33	73
20) Graduate school considerations	46	32	71	85	8	61	74	-42	74
Location									
13) Commuting convenience	63	69	65	70	23	24	76	- 7	71
14) Easy access to home (res. stud.)	67	62	72	68	22	28	75	-13	78
15) General geographic location	60	50	75	81	12	43	77	-27	77
Financial									
11) Total cost	24	18	82	72	9	63	30	-12	16
12) Amount of financial aid offered	38	34	62	59	18	43	70	-36	54
Social Activities									
10) Number of students	45	42	85	80	11	49	72	-30	65
21) Appearance of campus	55	49	87	86	11	48	80	-31	76
24) Diversified student body	51	47	86	78	9	40	70	-23	67
26) Degree of freedom allowed stud.	68	62	85	82	13	33	72	-10	66
29) Extra-curricular activities	66	55	86	85	7	37	79	-24	62
30) Social activities	59	48	88	85	7	44	72	-24	51
External Advice									
33) Family advice	36	19	82	82	4	67	35	-16	41
34) What students had to say	52	30	73	79	7	56	56	-26	69
Mixed									
17) Dorms available	65	58	72	86	8	36	78	-20	83

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

One major impression that can be obtained from these data is that no-show freshmen had positive attitudes toward Hofstra as well as toward the college they chose to attend, although obviously not as positive. For example, the respondents were more positive toward the colleges attended than Hofstra on all the attributes for both 1972 and 1973. On the other hand, more than 50% of the attributes elicited a greater positivity than negativity towards Hofstra for 1972; 17 of 22 in 1972, and 11 out of 22 in 1973. Positivity is defined as occurring when at least one-half of the sample reacts positively to an item and conversely negativity is defined as occurring when less than one-half of the sample reacts positively. Specifically, for 1973, five of the eight academic items, all three location items, two of the six social activities items and the dorms available item were rated positively by more than 50% of the freshman no-shows. Since these may be considereded positive attributes of Hofstra, we will list them in order of positivity: course offerings, commuting convenience, availability of desired major, easy access to home for a residential student, degree of freedom allowed students, dorms available, academic reputation, extra-curricular activities, innovative curriculum, quality of facutly and general geographic location.

Although the overall impression that seems to be conveyed by the analysis of the no-show freshmen responses is more positivity than negativity to Hofstra, (afterall they did apply) there are nevertheless, large differences between this population and the freshmen who attended the University in the amount of positive reaction displayed to Hofstra. Column 8 in Table 9 is a comparison of 1973 freshman shows and no-shows on the 22 attributes. Minus signs indicate more positivity by the freshman shows than the no-shows. The results are rather striking. In no instance were the no-shows more positive than the shows, and the magnitude of the difference in positivity between these populations is substantial. Among the academic factors, no-show freshmen were less positive to Hofstra than shows by as much as 42% (graduate school considerations) with most of the percentage differences lying in the 20% range. Other items that discriminated no-shows from shows were amount of financial aid offered, job and career considerations, appearance of campus and number of students. On the other hand, shows and no-shows were closest on commuting convenience, degree of freedom allowed students, total cost, availability of desired major, and easy access to home for a residential student.

To better understand the decision-making process of a student selecting a college, data are presented in Table 9 for each item on the percentage of no-shows who were 1) both positive to Hofstra and negative to the college finally selected (column 5) and 2) both negative to Hofstra and positive to college attended (column 6). The former can be thought of as some of Hofstra's strongest points and the latter some of the weakest. The percentages for the strongest points range from 4% to 23% with the median at 9%. The strongest points are innovative curriculum (16%) amount of financial aid awarded (18%), easy access to home for residential students (22%) and commuting convenience (23%). The percentages for the weakest items range from 24% to 67% with the median at 42%. The weakest items are what students had to say (56%), graduate school considerations (61%), total cost (63%), and family advice (67%). It might appear that there is an inconsistency in the financial factor results. The shows and no-shows were equally unhappy about the cost of Hofstra and when the no-shows decided not to attend the total cost probably weighed heavily in their decision. As for the amount of financial aid, although it is viewed unfavorably by no-shows, it is viewed positively by shows and for some no-shows was viewed more favorably at Hofstra than at the school they finally attended, which may have won out for other reasons.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As serious as these data are with respect to such pragmatic concerns as recruitment issues, more important problems are revealed when the data of no-show freshmen between 1972 and 1973 are compared. In this case, there are strong indications that there is an increased negativity towards Hofstra, while at the same time this negative attitude did not find its way to the attended colleges.

In 1972, Hofstra was evaluated more negatively than positively on about 20% of the items that the no-show population had initially rated as important in their college choice. In no instance did these students rate the other college more negatively than positively. However, in 1973, almost 50% of the items showed this negative trend towards Hofstra. In order to assess this change, certain questions must be answered. First, how may items rated in 1972 as negative remained so in 1973? Second, were the large increases in negativity among these items? Third, were the additional items rated as negative in 1973 but not in 1972 large changes? Fourth, was the general pattern between 1972 and 1973 one of increased negativity towards Hofstra, and how many items showed such large increases? Could the large changes in attitudes towards Hofstra be explained on the basis that there are also large changes in the attitudes students have towards universities in general? This would be exemplified by changing attitudes between 1972 and 1973 to the University the student attended. Lastly, how do these changes in attitudes relate to the way the AAS attributes changed in importance between 1972 and 1973?

Table 9 is an attempt to answer these questions in the following way. All circled entries in the table are percentages in which fewer than 50% of the respondents indicated a positive attitude towards Hofstra or to the college they attended. Single connecting lines between percentages indicate moderate or substantial decreases in positivity between 1972 and 1973. Double connecting lines are moderate or substantial increases between the two years.

The first thing that one can see from this table is that there were five negative items in 1972 and eleven in 1973. All five items rated as negative to Hofstra in 1972 were also negative in 1973. Second, two of these items showed substantial decreases between 1972 and 1973, i.e. increased negativity, and while the percentages of the remaining three also decreased, the amount was only slight. Third, of the six items which in 1972 were positive but were negative in 1973, four represent substantial or moderate amounts of change.

To evaluate the general pattern between 1972 and 1973, one can see that of the remaining eleven items in Table 9, three more items showed substantial decreases, eight were fairly stable. In general, between 1972 and 1973, 45% of the items showed substantial change, and all were increases in negative reaction to Hofstra University. On the other hand, certain changes did occur between 1972 and 1973 with respect to positive attitudes toward the colleges attended by the no-show freshmen. Four items decreased in positivity, while two items increased. Nevertheless, the important observation that can be made from these changes is that in only one case could it be used for explanation for the decrease in positive reactions to Hofstra University. Specifically, innovative curriculum showed a decrease between 1972 and 1973 in positive reaction to Hofstra but there also was a corresponding change in attitude to the college the student actually attended.

In one case, however, graduate school consideration, there was a large decrease in positive reaction to Hofstra but this was accompanied by a large increase in positive reaction to the attend college.

In summary, it is interesting to ovserve where the significant decreases in positive reaction to Hofstra are occurring between 1972 and 1973. Five out of the nine substantial negative changes are in the academic factors. Specifically, academic reputation, individual academic program, innovative curriculum, career and job considerations, and graduate school considerations. Perhaps as important to this institution, if not more so, are the very substantial decreases observed under the external advice factor. Family advice decreased by 17% and the reaction from other students went from 52%, i.e. a positive reaction, to 30%, a change of 22%. Finally, two student factors, extra-curricular activities and social activities, declined substantially in positivity.

Finally, inferences can be made about how Hofstra is viewed vis-a-vis other colleges by enrolled students in 1973. This can be accomplished by comparing the reactions to Hofstra by Hofstra shows and the reaction to colleges actually attended by Hofstra no-shows (columns 4 and 5 in Table 9). Most of the items are rated similarly; on some, Hofstra suffers by comparison; and there is one on which Hofstra is perceived more favorably. Hofstra appears to suffer on graduate school considerations, total cost, social activities, family advice and what students had to say. The amount of financial aid is viewed more favorably at Hofstra than at other attended colleges. Furthermore, students when evaluating the colleges they attended, other than Hofstra, reacted positively to all items but those who attended Hofstra reacted positively to all items except total cost and family advice.

Students' Reactions to Hofstra and To Attended University-1972 and 1973 by Preference Level

In order to investigate more fully the increased negativity to Hofstra between 1972 and 1973, the data in Table 9 were re-analyzed in the following way. For the fifteen attributes which show either substantial changes in reaction to Hofstra, or negativity to Hofstra, the 1972 and 1973 sample data were subdivided by preference level, i.e. Hofstra as first, second, or third through fifth choice school. These data are presented in Table 10. In order to understand which sample contributed significantly to the increased negative reaction, reference to academic reputation in Table 9 can be used as an example. The overall decrease between 1972 and 1973 was 11%. In Table 10, reference to Columns 3, 6, and 9, indicates that individuals who chose Hofstra as their second choice school were the major contributers to the effect. It was also suggested previously, that this reaction to Hofstra could not totally be explained by some total decrease in positive reaction to the academic reputation of universities, since the decrease in positive reaction to the university that the student actually attended was not of the same magnitude as that observed for Hofstra itself. This general statement holds up under this finer analysis since in Table 11 which is a comparable treatment of positive and negative reactions to the attended universities by preference level. Column 6 shows a change of only -8%. This represents an increased negativity to the university they attended, but it is not as large as -16%, the change that occurred to Hofstra for the same sample. In fact, on all of the academic factors, the negative trend for Hofstra is the result of second preference or third preference individuals. In some cases, career and job considerations and graduate school considerations, the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 10

No-Show Students' Reactions to Hofstra By College Preference on Selected Items
(in percentages)

Factors	(1) 1st Choice 1972 N=58	(2) 1st Choice 1973 N=47	(3) 1973 minus 1972	(4) 2nd Choice 1972 N=345	(5) 2nd Choice 1973 N=219	(6) 1973 minus 1972	(7) 3rd-5th Choice 1972 N=305	(8) 3rd-5th Choice 1973 N=249	(9) 1973 minus 1972
Academic									
1) Academic reputation	87	89	+ 2	80	64	-16	51	45	- 6
4) Individualized academic program	72	80	+ 8	54	55	+ 1	56	38	-18
5) Innovative curriculum	85	77	- 8	59	60	+ 1	62	46	-16
19) Career & job consid.	65	63	- 2	63	49	-14	44	30	-14
20) Graduate school consideration	59	82	+23	58	36	-22	48	20	-28
Location									
15) General geographic location	82	82	0	57	55	- 2	59	38	-21
Financial									
11) Total cost	16	7	- 9	28	17	-11	22	23	+ 1
12) Amount of financial aid offered	31	12	-19	44	36	- 8	32	39	+ 7
Social Activities									
10) Number of students	66	80	+14	42	37	- 5	42	41	- 1
21) Appearance of campus	79	85	+ 6	56	49	- 7	48	43	- 5
24) Diversified student body	81	88	+ 7	53	53	0	47	38	- 9
29) Extra-curricular activities	81	82	+ 1	71	53	-18	58	51	- 7
30) Social activities	76	68	- 8	59	50	- 9	55	44	-11
External Advice									
33) Family advice	45	43	- 2	36	18	-18	34	16	-18
34) What students had to say	71	42	-29	51	31	-20	51	26	-25

Table 11

No-Show Students' Reactions To Attended Colleges
By College Preference on Selected Items

(in percentages)

Factors	(1) 1st Choice 1972 N=58	(2) 1st Choice 1973 N=47	(3) 1973 minus 1972	(4) 2nd Choice 1972 N=345	(5) 2nd Choice 1973 N=219	(6) 1973 minus 1972	(7) 3rd-5th Choice 1972 N=305	(8) 3rd-5th Choice 1973 N=249	(9) 1973 minus 1972
Academic									
1) Academic reputation	81	55	-26	95	87	- 8	93	93	0
4) Individualized academic program	57	53	- 4	83	78	- 5	82	86	+ 4
5) Innovative curriculum	69	55	-14	87	75	-12	88	86	- 2
19) Career & job consid.	44	42	- 2	81	79	- 2	82	90	+ 8
20) Graduate school consideration	36	41	+ 5	71	87	+16	89	93	+ 4
Location									
15) General geographic location	68	53	-15	72	82	+10	78	82	+ 4
Financial									
11) Total cost	94	81	-13	82	75	- 7	79	67	-12
12) Amount of financial aid offered	69	51	-18	67	62	- 5	55	56	+ 1
Social Activities									
10) Number of students	69	50	-19	90	79	-11	83	84	+ 1
21) Appearance of campus	70	45	-25	87	88	+ 1	89	89	0
24) Diversified student body	76	47	-29	87	83	- 4	87	80	- 7
29) Extra-curricular activities	74	57	-17	89	84	- 5	86	88	+ 2
30) Social activities	85	58	-27	88	87	- 1	87	86	- 1
External Advice									
33) Family advice	72	74	+ 2	85	82	- 3	81	82	+ 1
34) What students had to say	50	53	+ 3	80	80	0	71	82	+11

effect is a combination of both of these samples. Once again, analysis of Table 11 shows that the decreases observed for the other school were not of the same magnitude as that observed for Hofstra University.

As discussed previously, very large changes in reaction to Hofstra were observed for those factors concerned with external advice. In Table 10, it is interesting to observe that the substantial changes between 1972 and 1973 were the result of all groups. That is, even those who chose Hofstra as their first choice school, but did not attend, indicated that between these years, there was an increased negative reaction from their families as well as by other students. From Table 11, it can be concluded that this effect is a Hofstra phenomenom, since positive attitudes shown in 1972 to the attended university remains stable or increased very slightly in 1973.

An additional way to analyze the data presented in Tables 10 and 11 is to look at the trends over preference level for the 1972 and 1973 samples with particular attention to the 1973 sample. The magnitude of positivity toward Hofstra decreased over preference for no-shows. There was a dramatic increase in negative reactions from first choice to third-fifth choice on the academic factor, social activities factor, and external advice factor. On the other hand, for this group of students, negative reaction to the financial factor decreased the further they moved from really considering Hofstra as a choice.

Just the reverse trends are apparent for the no-show students' reactions to the colleges they attended on academic, financial, and external advice factors; i.e. the greatest positivity to colleges attended occurred for those for whom Hofstra was third-fifth choice. One difference is worth noting; reaction to the financial factor. Positivity decreased as preference for Hofstra declined.

Two hypotheses are worth considering. One, students who list Hofstra as a third-fifth choice are not really a strong potential market. The most likely market is probably the Hofstra second-choice group. Two, students who list Hofstra as first choice but do not attend are most likely influenced negatively by the total cost.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Applicant's Survey - Hofstra University (continued)

(1) Important in Decision		(2) Positive Reaction to Hofstra	(3) Positive Reaction to College Attending	
_____ 6.	Courses probably not too difficult	6._____	6._____	2(24-26)
_____ 7.	Quality of faculty	7._____	7._____	2(27-29)
_____ 8.	School calendar system used	8._____	8._____	2(30-32)
_____ 9.	Grading system used	9._____	9._____	2(33-35)
_____10.	Number of students	10._____	10._____	2(36-38)
_____11.	Total cost	11._____	11._____	2(39-41)
_____12.	Amount of financial aid	12._____	12._____	2(42-44)
_____13.	Commuting convenience	13._____	13._____	2(45-47)
_____14.	Easy access to home	14._____	14._____	2(48-50)
_____15.	General geographic location	15._____	15._____	2(51-53)
_____16.	Proximity to New York City	16._____	16._____	2(54-56)
_____17.	Dorms available	17._____	17._____	2(57-59)
_____18.	A predominantly residential college	18._____	18._____	2(60-62)
_____19.	Career and job considerations	19._____	19._____	2(63-65)
_____20.	Graduate school considerations	20._____	20._____	2(66-68)
_____21.	Appearance of campus	21._____	21._____	3(9-11)
_____22.	Church affiliated	22._____	22._____	3(12-14)
_____23.	Closely-knit college community	23._____	23._____	3(15-17)
_____24.	Diversified student body	24._____	24._____	3(18-20)
_____25.	Students involved in political activities	25._____	25._____	3(21-23)
_____26.	Degree of freedom allowed students	26._____	26._____	3(24-26)
_____27.	Availability of counseling services	27._____	27._____	3(27-29)
_____28.	Intercollegiate sports emphasized	28._____	28._____	3(30-32)
_____29.	Extracurricular activities	29._____	29._____	3(33-35)
_____30.	Social activities	30._____	30._____	3(36-38)
_____31.	High school guidance counselor	31._____	31._____	3(39-41)
_____32.	College admissions representative	32._____	32._____	3(42-44)
_____33.	Family advice	33._____	33._____	3(45-47)
_____34.	What students had to say	34._____	34._____	3(48-50)
_____35.	Hofstra University publications	35._____	35._____	3(51-53)
_____36.	Transfer students: credits accepted from previous college	36._____	36._____	3(54-56)
_____37.	Other: specify _____	37._____	37._____	3(57-59)

4. We would welcome your comments on Hofstra's admissions procedures. (Use the back of this page if you need more room).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix 1

S72NO - CSHE

Applicant's Survey - Hofstra University

For office use only
1(2-8)

NAME: _____
Last Middle Initial First

ADDRESS: _____

1. Will you be attending college in September 1972? Yes:___ No: ___ 1(34)

   a. If Yes, which college _____ 1(35-38)

   b. If No, place a check next to those items which express your reason(s) for not attending college this fall.

   ___ 1. Could not afford college
   ___ 2. Did not receive financial aid
   ___ 3. Got married
   ___ 4. Got a job
   ___ 5. Needed at home
   ___ 6. Needed time off
   7. Other; specify _____ 1(39-45)

   c. If you will not be attending college in September 1972, do you plan to resume your studies at a future date? Yes ___ When ___; No __ 1(46-50)

2. Please list the colleges that accepted you for admission in September 1972 in order of your preference. (Please include Hofstra)

   1. First preference _____ 1(51-54)
   2. Second preference _____ 1(55-58)
   3. Third preference _____ 1(59-62)
   4. Fourth preference _____ 1(63-66)
   5. Fifth preference _____ 1(67-70)

3. Below is a list of items that might have influenced your decision as to which college to attend. In Column 1 check those items that were important in your decision. In Column 2 check those items that you reacted favorably to when you were considering Hofstra University. In Column 3 check those items that you reacted favorably to when you were considering the college you choose.

(1) Important in Decision		(2) Positive Reaction to Hofstra	(3) Positive Reaction to College Attending	
____1.	Academic reputation	1.____	1.____	2(9-11)
____2.	Course offerings	2.____	2.____	2(12-14)
____3.	Availability of desired major	3.____	3.____	2(15-17)
____4.	Individualized academic program	4.____	4.____	2(18-20)
____5.	Innovative curriculum	5.____	5.____	2(21-23)

(Please continue on next page)

(1)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Important in Your Decision		Strong Points of Hofstra	Strong Points of Chosen College
31. _____	Total cost	32. _____	33. _____
34. _____	Amount of financial aid offered	35. _____	36. _____
37. _____	Commuting convenience	38. _____	39. _____
40. _____	Easy access to home for a residential student	41. _____	42. _____
43. _____	General geographic location	44. _____	45. _____
46. _____	Proximity to New York City	47. _____	48. _____
49. _____	Dorms available	50. _____	51. _____
52. _____	A predominantly residential college	53. _____	54. _____
55. _____	Career and job considerations	56. _____	57. _____
58. _____	Graduate school considerations	59. _____	60. _____
61. _____	Appearance of campus	62. _____	63. _____
64. _____	Church affiliated	65. _____	66. _____
67. _____	Closely-knit college community	68. _____	69. _____
70. _____	Diversified student body	71. _____	72. _____
73. _____	Students involved in political activities	74. _____	75. _____
76. _____	Degree of freedom allowed students	77. _____	78. _____
79. _____	Availability of counseling services	80. _____	81. _____
82. _____	Intercollegiate sports emphasized	83. _____	84. _____
85. _____	Extracurricular activities	86. _____	87. _____
88. _____	Social activities	89. _____	90. _____
91. _____	High school guidance counselor's advice	92. _____	93. _____
94. _____	College admissions representative's advice	95. _____	96. _____
97. _____	Family advice	98. _____	99. _____
100. _____	What students had to say	101. _____	102. _____
103. _____	Publications of the college or university	104. _____	105. _____
106. _____	Transfer students' credits accepted from previous college	107. _____	108. _____
109. _____	Other specify _____	110. _____	111. _____

4. We would welcome your comments on Hofstra's admissions procedures.

Thank you!

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Accepted Applicant's Survey - Hofstra University

Please print legibly

NAME: _____
Last First Middle Initial

ADDRESS: _____
Number and Street City or Town State Zip Code

YOUR SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER: ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

1. Please list the colleges, including Hofstra, that accepted you for admission in September 1973 in order of your personal preference.

   1. First preference _____
   2. Second preference _____
   3. Third preference _____
   4. Fourth preference _____
   5. Fifth preference _____

2. Which college do you plan to attend in September, 1973? _____

3. Below we list a variety of considerations that might have influenced your decision about college in September. In Column 1, please check whatever items were important to you in making your decision. In Column 2, please check whatever items seemed to you, to be strong points of Hofstra University. If you do not expect to attend Hofstra, please use Column 3 to check whatever items seemed to you to be strong points of the college (if any) that you do expect to attend

(1) Important in Your Decision		(2) Strong Points of Hofstra	(3) Strong Points of Chosen College
1 ____	Academic reputation	2. ____	3. ____
4 ____	Course offerings	5. ____	6. ____
7 ____	Availability of desired major	8 ____	9. ____
10 ____	Individualized academic program	11. ____	12. ____
13 ____	Innovative curriculum	14 ____	15. ____
16 ____	Courses probably not too difficult	17 ____	18. ____
19. ____	Quality of faculty	20. ____	21. ____
22 ____	School calendar system used	23. ____	24. ____
25 ____	Grading system used	26. ____	27. ____
28 ____	Number of students	29 ____	30. ____

(Please continue on other side)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Accepted Applicant's Survey - Hofstra University

Please enter your name and address and the responses to questions 1 and 2 directly on this sheet. Instructions for the computer answer sheet follow question 2.

NAME: _____
Last First Middle Initial

ADDRESS: _____
Number and Street City or Town State Zip Code

1. Please list the colleges, including Hofstra, that accepted you for admission in September, 1973 in order of your personal preference.

   1. First preference _____
   2. Second preference _____
   3. Third preference _____
   4. Fourth preference _____
   5. Fifth preference _____

2. Below we list a variety of considerations that might have influenced your decision about college in September. In Column 1, please check whatever items were important to you in making your decision. In Column 2, please check whatever items seemed, to you, to be strong points of Hofstra University.

(1) Important in Your Decision		(2) Strong Points of Hofstra
1.____	Academic reputation	2.____
3.____	Course offerings	4.____
5.____	Availability of desired major	6.____
7.____	Individualized academic program	8.____
9.____	Innovative curriculum	10.____
11.____	Courses probably not too difficult	12.____
13.____	Quality of faculty	14.____
15.____	School calendar system used	16.____
17.____	Grading system used	18.____
19.____	Number of students	20.____
21.____	Total cost	22.____
23.____	Amount of financial aid offered	24.____
25.____	Commuting convenience	26.____
27.____	Easy access to home for a residential student	28.____
29.____	General geographic location	30.____

(Please continue on other side)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(1) Important in Your Decision		(2) Strong Points of Hofstra
31.____	Proximity to New York City	32.____
33.____	Dorms available	34.____
35.____	A predominantly residential college	36.____
37.____	Career and job considerations	38.____
39.____	Graduate school considerations	40.____
41.____	Appearance of campus	42.____
43.____	Church affiliated	44.____
45.____	Closely-knit college community	46.____
47.____	Diversified student body	48.____
49.____	Students involved in political activities	50.____
51.____	Degree of freedom allowed students	52.____
53.____	Availability of counseling services	54.____
55.____	Intercollegiate sports emphasized	56.____
57.____	Extracurricular activities	58.____
59.____	Social activities	60.____
61.____	High school guidance counselor's advice	62.____
63.____	College admissions representative's advice	64.____
65.____	Family advice	66.____
67.____	What students had to say	68.____
69.____	Publications of the college or university	70.____
71.____	Transfer students: credits accepted from previous college	72.____
73.____	Other: specify_____	74.____

It would be very helpful to us if you would transfer your checks in question 2 above to the enclosed answer sheet in the following manner. Each response box on the answer sheet has a number on top which corresponds to a number in the two columns. For every check you have entered, blacken the first position (1/A) in the response box on the answer sheet whose number corresponds to the number in front of your check. For example, if you have checked Course offerings as having been important in your college decision, then in the third response box on the answer sheet blacken the first position (1/A). Similarly, if you have checked Dorms available as a strong point of Hofstra, then in the response box on the answer sheet that has a 34 on top of it blacken the 1/A.

Would you please also enter your name in the grid that is in the upper right hand section of the answer sheet and your social security number in the grid below labelled "Student Number."

Please return both this survey sheet and the answer sheet (filled in or not).

We would welcome your comments on Hofstra's admissions procedure on the back of the answer sheet.

Thank you!